

IN THE DRAWINGS

Submitted herewith is a replacement drawing sheet in substitution for the original Figure 29 filed with this application.

Attached: Replacement Figure 29

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 are presently active in this case, Claims 1-3 and 5-8 having been amended and Claim 9 added by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, the drawings were objected to as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Claims 3 and 6 were objected to as being in improper dependent form for failure to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claims 1, 5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Spruit et al. (U.S. Patent 6,243,339, hereinafter "Spruit"); Claims 1, 2, 5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Spruit further considered in combination with Narumi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,914,866, herein "Narumi"); and Claims 3, 4, 6 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Spruit when further considered in combination with Fujimoto et al. (U.S. Patent 6,940,800, herein "Fujimoto").

In response to the objection to the drawings, the claims have been amended to delete the parameters identified at page 2 of the outstanding Official Action as not being shown in the drawings. Nevertheless, submitted herewith is a new Figure 29 in which the reference numeral "73" has been corrected to -81- consistent with Applicants' disclosure. No new matter has been added.

In response to the objection to Claims 3 and 6, these claims have been amended so as to limit the subject matter of a previously recited claim, and accordingly the objection to these claims is believed to have been overcome.

In addition, the claims have been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter so as thereby to more clearly patentably define over the applied prior art. Support for the changes to Claims 1 and 5, is found in Applicants' disclosure shown in Figures 15 and 19. Support for the changes introduced into Claims 3 and 6, is found in Applicants' Figures 14 and 27.

Also submitted herewith is new Claim 9 which finds support in Figures 22 and 29. No new matter has been added.


In light of the present amendment, the pending claims are believed to be clearly patentably distinguishing over the applied prior art. In particular, it is Applicants' view that Spruit, Narumi and Fujimoto neither singly nor in combination disclose how to process the physical address information read from the wobble. It is therefore respectfully submitted that these references do not have a wobble clock processing system.

In contrast, the amended claims recite how to utilize the wobble clock, for example, reciting "physical address information is recorded in the form of phase modulation of a groove wobble," "obtaining a signal indicating a period of a symbol clock for the phase modulation by a clock generator," and "a value for evaluating the reliability of the physical address information by using the integrated (or low pass filtered) output and the signal indicating the period of the symbol clock." Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references are clearly deficient in regard to the amended claims, and that the amended claims patentably define thereover.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, and in light of the above discussion, no further issues are believed to be outstanding, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 03/06)  
EHK/rac

I:\ATTY\EHK\25's\250220\250220US-AM.DOC